



PTO/SB/17 (05-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003

Effective 01/01/2003, Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT	(\\$) 0.00
--------------------------------	-------------------

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

Check Credit Card Money Order Other None
 Deposit Account

Deposit Account Number **08-3425**

Deposit Account Name **Human Genome Sciences, Inc.**

The Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

- Charge fee(s) indicated below Credit any overpayments
 Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application
 Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION**1. BASIC FILING FEE**

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)		
1001	750	2001	375	Utility filing fee	
1002	330	2002	165	Design filing fee	
1003	520	2003	260	Plant filing fee	
1004	750	2004	375	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	
SUBTOTAL (1)		(\\$)	0.00		

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

Total Claims	-20** =	x	=	Fee Paid
Multiple Dependent	-3** =	x	=	

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)		
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20	
1201	84	2201	42	Independent claims in excess of 3	
1203	280	2203	140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid	
1204	84	2204	42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent	
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent	
SUBTOTAL (2)		(\\$)	0.00		

** or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

Complete if Known

Application Number	08/917,710
Filing Date	August 26, 1997
First Named Inventor	Daniel P. Bednarik
Examiner Name	S. Wegert
Art Unit	1647
Attorney Docket No.	PF307

FEE CALCULATION (continued)**3. ADDITIONAL FEES**

Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)
1051	130	2051	65
1052	50	2052	25
1053	130	1053	130
1812	2,520	1812	2,520
1804	920*	1804	920*
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*
1251	110	2251	55
1252	410	2252	205
1253	930	2253	465
1254	1,450	2254	725
1255	1,970	2255	985
1401	320	2401	160
1402	320	2402	160
1403	280	2403	140
1451	1,510	1451	1,510
1452	110	2452	55
1453	1,300	2453	650
1501	1,300	2501	650
1502	470	2502	235
1503	630	2503	315
1460	130	1460	130
1807	50	1807	50
1806	180	1806	180
8021	40	8021	40
1809	750	2809	375
1810	750	2810	375
1801	750	2801	375
1802	900	1802	900
Other fee (specify)			

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\\$) 0.00**SUBMITTED BY**

Complete (if applicable)

Name (Print/Type)	Lin J. Hymel	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	45,414	Telephone	(301) 251-6015
Signature	<i>Lin J. Hymel</i>			Date	June 23, 2003

RECEIVED
JUN 26 2003
TECH CENTER 1600
USPTO



AF

Docket No.: PF307

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Bednarik, Daniel P.

Application No.: 08/917,710

Group Art Unit: 1647

Filed: August 26, 1997

Examiner: Wegert, Sandra L.

For: Soluble Interleukin-1 Receptor Accessory
Molecule

#23
M.G.J.
7/1/03
NE

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

RECEIVED

Mailstop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

JUN 26 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated April 22, 2003 (Paper No. 22), and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, Applicants hereby request consideration of the following remarks. Applicants submit herewith (a) a Return Receipt Postcard, (b) a Fee Transmittal Sheet, and (c) Exhibits A and B.

REMARKS

Rejection of Claims 20-29, 38, 39, 49-58, and 60-73 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 20-29, 38, 39, 49-58, and 60-73 stand rejected as allegedly lacking either a well-established or a specific, substantial, and credible utility. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Alleged Lack of Specific Function

This rejection has been maintained because Applicants allegedly have not provided experimental data demonstrating a specific utility of the claimed polynucleotides or the polypeptides they encode. The Examiner has stated: